

**Remarks**

By the present amendment and response, Applicants have amended claims 8, 9, 11-13, 15-18, 22, 23, 35, 42-45, and 49; cancelled claims 1-7, 19-21, 24-34, 36-41, 46-48, 50, and 51; and added new claims 52-60. Consequently, claims 8-18, 22, 23, 35, 42-45, 49, and 52-60 are pending in the present application, with claims 8, 15-18, 22, 35, 42-45, and 49 being independent claims.

**I. Objections to Claims 8, 15-18, 22, 35, 42-45, and 49 (Allowable Subject Matter)**

At page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated that claims 8, 15-18, 22, 35, 42-45, and 49 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Applicants have amended 8, 15-18, 22, 35, 42-45, and 49 to include all of the limitations of their base claims and any intervening claims. As a result, claims 8, 15-18, 22, 35, 42-45, and 49 are believed to be allowable.

**II. Claim Rejections**

**A. Rejection of claims 1-7, 9-14, 19-21, 25-34, 36-41, and 46-48 over Soga in view of Bruno-Raimondi, Wolk, and Gilby**

Claims 1-7, 9-14, 19-21, 25-34, 36-41, and 46-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Soga (US 2003/0230524 A1) in view of Bruno-Raimondi (US 6,437,354 B1), Wolk ("Ultraviolet Absorbance Spectroscopy in 3-Dimensional Microfluidic Chip") and Gilby (US 5,900,934).

As noted previously, claims 1-7, 19-21, 25-34, 36-41, and 46-48 have been cancelled herewith. As a result, the rejection of such claims is believed to be moot.

With regard to claims 9-14, each has been amended to depend, either directly or indirectly, from amended claim 8. The Examiner has already indicated that amended claim

8 would be allowable, and since dependent claims inherently include all the limitations of the claim incorporated by reference into the dependent claim (37 CFR 1.75(c)), it is believed that dependent claims 9-14 should also be allowable.

B. Rejection of claims 23, 24, 50, and 51 over Soga in view of Bruno-Raimondi, Wolk, Gilby, and Miroslav

Claims 23, 24, 50, and 51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Soga (US 2003/0230524 A1) in view of Bruno-Raimondi (US 6,437,354 B1), Wolk ("Ultraviolet Absorbance Spectroscopy in 3-Dimensional Microfluidic Chip"), Gilby (US 5,900,934), and Miroslav (US 6,206,771 B1).

As noted previously, claims 24, 50, and 51 have been cancelled herewith. As a result, the rejection of such claims is believed to be moot.

Regarding claim 23, the claim has been amended to depend from amended claim 8. The Examiner has already indicated that amended claim 8 would be allowable, and since dependent claims inherently include all the limitations of the claim incorporated by reference into the dependent claim (37 CFR 1.75(c)), it is believed that dependent claim 23 should also be allowable.

III. New Claims

New claims 52-60 all depend, directly or indirectly from amended claim 8. No new matter has been added. The Examiner has already indicated that amended claim 8 would be allowable, and since dependent claims inherently include all the limitations of the claim incorporated by reference into the dependent claim (37 CFR 1.75(c)), it is believed that dependent claims 52-60 should also be allowable.

**Conclusion**

By virtue of the amendments and arguments provided herein, Applicants believe that all pending claims 8-18, 22, 23, 35, 42-45, 49, and 52-60 are in good condition for allowance, and respectfully request allowance thereof. If any additional information should be required in considering this Response, or if there are any questions or deficiencies with regard to this Response that can be addressed by telephone, the USPTO representative is encouraged to contact the undersigned directly at (626) 351-8200, ext. 6503.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 10, 2004

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Vincent K. Gustafson  
Reg. No. 46,182

**USPTO Customer No.: 32763**